



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,791	05/29/2001	David Boreham	P5834	7719

7590 10/28/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two N. Market st.
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,791

Applicant(s)

BOREHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Kuen S Lu

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings filed on 5/29/2001 are not approved by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152, formal drawings are required in response to this office action, Figures 1-24.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p) because Figure legends are poor. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is mostly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites only a single step, a method comprising of a single step for generating the value of at least one attribute of the first entry of a directory system. This single and only method of the claim, seems to encompass all possible manners for

restricting access to private information, as set forth in the preamble [MPEP 706.03(c)].

Ex Parte Bullock, 1907 C.D.93;127 O.G.1580.2164.08(a).

>A single step claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to Hyatt is possible, where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor. Although the court in Fiers v. Sugano, 984 F.2d 164, 25 USPQ2d 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1993) did not decide the enablement issue, it did suggest that a claim directed to all DNAs that code for a specified polypeptide is analogous to a single means claim.<

Claim 5 recites only a single step, a method comprising of a single step for configuring a directory server system comprising a plural of entries where the method is to define a CoS attribute to a target entry. This single and only method of the claim, seems to encompass all possible manners for restricting access to private information, as set forth in the preamble [MPEP 706.03(c)]. Ex Parte Bullock, 1907 C.D.93;127 O.G.1580.2164.08(a).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 through 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Claim 1 sets forth sharing attributes of a first entry with the entries of a directory server. The body of the claim, however, merely recites the single step of generating the value of at least one attribute of the first entry. The claim fails to recite a series of steps that logically amount to the method of sharing attributes.

Claim 5 sets forth configuring a directory server comprising a plurality of entries. The body of the claim, however, merely recites the single step of configuring a directory server comprising a plurality of entries. The claim fails to recite a series of steps that logically amount to the method of configuring a directory server.

Claims 2-4 are rejected due to their dependency on Claim 1.

Claims 6-15 are rejected due to their dependency on Claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by iPlanet Directory Server Administrator's Guide (Version 5.0, April 2001, Sun Microsystems, Inc., hereafter iPlanet).

As per claims 1 and 16, iPlanet teaches "generating the value of at least one attribute of the first entry, whereby the user's attribute may be shared with other entries in a manner transparent to an application" at Pages 171-172, Para. "Creating a New CoS", steps 1 through 8, by sharing (adding through listing) attributes at step 5 and overriding target entry attribute at step 6 for making it transparent to application.

As per claims 2 and 17, iPlanet teaches "generating the value of the at least one attribute at the time the entry is transmitted to an application" at Page 172, step 7 by overriding target entry attribute and being operational, so that it is not visible to the client applications unless explicitly requested.

As per claims 3 and 18, iPlanet teaches "generating the value of the at least one attribute immediately prior to the time the entry is transmitted to an application" at Page 172, step 6 by overriding target entry attribute and being operational, so that it is not visible to the client applications unless explicitly requested.

As per claims 4 and 19, iPlanet teaches "using a class of service logic to generate the at least one attribute of the user" at Pages 171-173, Para. "Creating a New CoS", steps 1 through 8, by using Directory Server Console to create entry and its attributes.

As per claims 5 and 20, iPlanet teaches "defining a class of service (CoS) attribute for a target entry, the CoS attribute including a CoS Definition entry and a Template entry, whereby the CoS Definition entry and the Template entry interact to provide an attribute value to a target entry that lies within a CoS scope of the CoS Definition entry and the Template entry" at Pages 174 and 177, Section "Creating the CoS definition

Entry from the Command Line" by using ldapmodify command or at Pages 171-173, Para. "Creating a New CoS", steps 1 through 8 by using Directory Server Console.

As per claim 6 and 21, iPlanet teaches "the CoS Definition entry is stored as an LDAP subentry below the branch at which it is effective" at Page 176, Table 5-3 by showing LDAPSubEntry as superior class for Pointer, Indirect and Classic CoS.

As per claims 7 and 22, iPlanet teaches "the CoS Definition entry identifies a CoS type being used" at Page 176, Table 5-3, CoS Definitions shows CoS type "Indirect CoS".

As per claims 8 and 23, iPlanet teaches "the Template entry contains a list of attribute values that are shared" at Page 170 Diagram by showing values of attributes departmentNumber and manager are shared between entries.

As per claims 9 and 24, iPlanet teaches "the CoS scope is defined by the DN of the CoS Definition entry" at Page 173, lines 2-3 by showing one of the target entry's attributes, a classic CoS.

As per claim 10 and 25, iPlanet teaches "the presence or absence of the target entry's CoS specifier determines whether the target entry may receive a CoS value" at Page 170 Diagram by showing the target entry receives CoS values for attributes of CoS definition entry and using a combination of the template DN and a CoS specifier to identify the template entry.

As per claims 11 and 26, iPlanet teaches "an attribute value stored in a CoS Template determines what value a target entry may receive as a CoS value" at

Page 170 Diagram by showing the target entry receives CoS values for attributes of CoS definition entry.

As per claims 12 and 27, iPlanet teaches "changing an attribute value in the Template entry" at Page 173, Section "Editing an Existing CoS".

As per claims 13 and 28, iPlanet teaches " automatically applying the changed attribute value to all entries that share the attribute" Page 173, step 6, Section "Editing an Existing CoS".

As per claims 14 and 29, iPlanet teaches "the changed attribute values are applied to an entry that shares the attribute at the time the entry is transmitted to an application" at at Page 172, step 7 by overriding target entry attribute and being operational.

As per claims 15 and 30, iPlanet teaches "the changed attribute values are applied to an entry that shares the attribute immediately prior to the time the entry is transmitted to an application" at Page 172, step 6 by overriding target entry attribute and being operational, so that it is not visible to the client applications unless explicitly requested.

Conclusions

4. The prior art made of record

A. iPlanet Directory Server Administrator's Guide, Version 5.0,
Sun Microsystems, Inc. Doc. ID 816-0799-01, April, 2001.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL

Patent Examiner

October 20, 2003


JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100